



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,922	01/26/2004	Carles Borrego Bel	8136ES	1921
23688	7590	06/19/2006	EXAMINER	
Bruce E. Harang PO BOX 872735 VANCOUVER, WA 98687-2735			PARRIES, DRUM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/707,922

Applicant(s)

BORREGO BEL ET AL.

Examiner

Dru M. Parries

Art Unit

2836

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-26-04.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the entire specification has the phrase "CC/CC converter" in it. The Examiner believes it is meant to read "DC/DC converter".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1, 2, 8, and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities: The Examiner believes the phrase "CC/CC converter" is meant to read "DC/DC converter".

Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claims 1, 5, 6, and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities: they all use indefinite claim language (i.e. "such as"). See MPEP 2173.05(d). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gronbach (2003/0155814) and Maeda (6,340,848). Gronbach teaches a vehicle with two networks at different voltage levels (42V and 14V), where each network can feed the other via a bi-directional DC-DC converter (22). He also teaches several equal shunted DC/DC converters

Art Unit: 2836

(20, 22) connecting the first and second networks connected to a common point. Both networks are fed via a battery (12 and 24) and one is connected to a generator (10). He also teaches loads not being able to be fully supported via one source, so converters, and the other network battery, help to provide support to the one network by supplying the extra power needed to supply to the loads ([0010]). He also teaches a control unit which controls the converters output to each load (last of [0012]). It would be obvious to communicate between the control unit and converters via a communications bus. Gronbach fails to teach having each converter having its own set of loads nor does he teach protection means in some of the loads of each set. Maeda teaches a power distribution system in a vehicle comprising sets of 14V loads (normal load) and 42V loads (large capacity load) in different parts of the vehicle each connected to a distribution box containing a DC/DC converter corresponding to each set of loads. He also teaches fuses (31f, 31d, 33f, 33d, 35d, 35f) protecting the all loads in each set (Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a plurality of DC/DC converters assigned to particular sets of loads to minimize the amount of wires running through the system (Maeda—Col. 5, lines 34-42) and to have more accuracy with different sets of loads. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate fuses into the load side of the converters to protect the loads from overcurrent or overvoltage.

6. Claims 2, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gronbach (2003/0155814) and Maeda (6,340,848) as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Nonaka (JP 08-111932 A). Gronbach and Maeda teach a vehicle power distribution system as described above. Gronbach teaches a controller that controls the output of

Art Unit: 2836

the converters (last of [0012]). Maeda teaches each set of 42V loads each being associated with a DC/DC converter. Gronbach and Maeda fail to explicitly teach detecting the current required by the loads. Nonaka teaches detecting the power requirement of a load. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to, via some point in the circuit, detect the current required by each load, so that Gronbach's controller will know what voltage to output from the converters to properly feed the loads.

7. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gronbach (2003/0155814) and Maeda (6,340,848) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tamai et al. (2002/0190690). Gronbach and Maeda teach a vehicle power distribution system as described above. They fail to teach the use of fuses and switches as protecting means for the loads. Tamai teaches the use of both fuses and controlled switches (22-25) as protection means (Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement fuses and switches into some of the load circuits to include extra protection against overcurrent and overvoltage.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dru M. Parries whose telephone number is (571) 272-8542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday from 8:00am to 5:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

Art Unit: 2836

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached on 571-272-2800 x 36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMP

6-7-2006



BRIAN SIRCUS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800